

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**RICHARD BLANCHARD,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**Civil Action No. 2:10cv62**

**JOEL ZIEGLER, Warden,**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER**

On July 27, 2010, Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert filed his Amended Report and Recommendation, wherein the parties were directed, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), to file with the Clerk of Court any written objections within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of the Report and Recommendation. No objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed. Accordingly, the Court will proceed with consideration of the Report and Recommendation reviewing for clear error.<sup>1</sup>

Upon examination of the report from the Magistrate Judge, it appears to the Court that the issues raised by the Petitioner's Application for Habeas Corpus, filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss or for Summary Judgment, were thoroughly considered by Magistrate Judge Seibert in his Report and Recommendation. Moreover, the Court, upon a review for clear error, is of the opinion that the Report and Recommendation accurately reflects the law applicable to the facts and circumstances before the Court in this action. Therefore, it is

---

<sup>1</sup>The failure of a party to object to a Report and Recommendation waives the party's right to appeal from a judgment of this Court based thereon and, additionally, relieves the Court of any obligation to conduct a *de novo* review of the issues presented. See *Wells v. Shriners Hospital*, 109 F.3d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1997); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-153 (1985).

**ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Seibert's Amended Report and Recommendation (Doc. 21) be, and the same hereby is, accepted and that this civil action be disposed of in accordance with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, it is

**ORDERED** that Respondent's Motion to Dismiss or in the Alternative for Summary Judgment (Doc. 11) shall be, and the same hereby is, **GRANTED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the petitioner's § 2241 petition shall be, and the same hereby is, **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Clerk shall enter judgment for the respondent. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of July 23, 2010 (Doc. 19), insofar as the same was amended, shall be, and the same hereby is, **VACATED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled action shall be **STRICKEN** from the docket of this Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that, if a party should desire to appeal the decision of this Court, written notice of appeal must be received by the Clerk of this Court within thirty (30) days from the date of the entry of the Judgment Order, pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. The \$5.00 filing fee for the notice of appeal and the \$450.00 docketing fee should also be submitted with the notice of appeal. In the alternative, at the time the notice of appeal is submitted, the petitioner may, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 24(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, seek leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

The Clerk of Court is directed to transmit a copy of this Order to all parties appearing herein.

**DATED:** August 25, 2010

  
United States District Judge